

# Briefing Paper

IWPR # R364

January 2013


## The Status of Women in the Greensboro Metropolitan Area, North Carolina

Women in the Greensboro area,<sup>1</sup> and in North Carolina as a whole, have made much progress during the last few decades. The majority of women work—many in professional jobs—and women are essential to the economic health of their communities. Yet, there are some ways in which women’s status still lags behind men’s, and not all women are prospering equally. This fact sheet provides basic information about the status of women in the Greensboro metropolitan area—including Alamance, Davidson, Davie, Forsyth, Guilford, Randolph, Stokes, and Yadkin counties—focusing on women’s earnings and workforce participation, level of education, poverty, access to child care, and health status. It also provides background demographic information about women in the region.

### Basic Facts About Women in the Greensboro Area

The female population in Greensboro is about as equally diverse as the female population in North Carolina as a whole. One in three women and girls (34 percent) in the Greensboro area are from a minority racial or ethnic group, compared with 35 percent in the state overall (Figure 1 and Table 1). In the Greensboro area, white women and girls constitute the largest racial or ethnic group at 66 percent, followed by black women and girls (22 percent). The proportions of Hispanic and Asian American women are the same in the Greensboro area as in the state but smaller than the national averages (Figure 1 and Table 1). Seven percent of women and girls in the Greensboro area are foreign-born, the same proportion as in the state as a whole (Table 1).

**Figure 1. Distribution of Women and Girls by Race and Ethnicity in the Greensboro Area, All Ages, 2008–2010**



Notes: Racial categories are exclusive: white, not Hispanic; black, not Hispanic; Asian American, not Hispanic; American Indian, not Hispanic; and other, not Hispanic. Those whose ethnicity is identified as Hispanic or Latino may be of any race. “Other” includes those who chose more than one racial category as well as those who chose a category other than white, black, Hispanic, Asian American, or American Indian. Total does not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

Source: IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

The median age for all women and girls in the Greensboro metropolitan area is 38 years, the same as the median age for all women and girls in North Carolina and the United States as a whole. Women aged 65 years and older make up 15 percent of the female population in the Greensboro area, the state, and the nation overall (Table 1).

<b>Table 1. Basic Demographic Statistics for Women and Girls</b>			
	<b>Greensboro Area</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>United States</b>
<b>Total Population</b>	1,411,955	9,561,558	309,349,689
Number of Women and Girls, All Ages	733,628	4,905,216	157,294,247
Median Age of All Women and Girls	38	38	38
Proportion of Women Aged 65 and Older	15%	15%	15%
<b>Distribution of Women and Girls by Race and Ethnicity, All Ages</b>			
White, Not Hispanic	66%	65%	64%
Black, Not Hispanic	22%	22%	13%
Hispanic	8%	8%	16%
Asian American, Not Hispanic	2%	2%	5%
American Indian, Not Hispanic	0.3%	1%	1%
Other, Not Hispanic	2%	2%	2%
<b>Proportion of Women and Girls Who Are Foreign-Born, All Ages</b>	7%	7%	13%
<b>Proportion of Women Who Are Married, Aged 18 and Older</b>	50%	50%	49%

Note: Data for the Greensboro area are for 2008–2010. Data for North Carolina and the United States are for 2010 only. Totals may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.

Those whose ethnicity is identified as Hispanic or Latino may be of any race. “Other” includes those who chose more than one racial category as well as those who chose a category other than white, black, Hispanic, Asian American, or American Indian.

Source: IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 and 2010 American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

## Work and Earnings

The majority of women aged 16 and older in the Greensboro area are in the labor force. Sixty percent are either employed or actively looking for work, compared with 59 percent in North Carolina as a whole (Table 2). The proportion of women overall in the labor force in the Greensboro area is lower than the proportion of men in the workforce (72 percent; Table 2), as it is in most jurisdictions.

In the Greensboro area, as in the state as a whole, the labor force participation rate is substantially higher for women who have dependent children (under age 18) than for all women (75 percent; Table 2). Mothers of dependent children, though, are much less likely than fathers of dependent children to be working or looking for work. Ninety-four percent of fathers with children under age 18 in the Greensboro area and in North Carolina overall are in the workforce (Table 2), suggesting that women are more likely than men to cut back on employment when they are parents.

While the majority of employed women in the Greensboro area work full-time (73 percent; Table 2), women are much more likely to work part-time than men (27 percent of employed women compared with 15 percent of employed men).<sup>2</sup> Women are more likely than men to say that they work part-time because they cannot find child care or for other family-care related reasons. In the state overall (data are not available for the Greensboro metropolitan area), 20 percent of women, compared with only 3 percent of men, give these reasons for working

part-time.<sup>3</sup> In addition, although the Great Recession has led both men and women to see an increase in part-time work for economic reasons during the last few years, women are more likely than men to work in the sectors and occupations where jobs are only available on a part-time basis (Shaefer 2009). Part-time workers are much less likely than full-time workers to have access to paid leave, health care, and employer-supported pensions (Society for Human Resource Management 2011).

In addition to these differences in hours worked, women and men in the Greensboro area, as in the nation as a whole, tend to work in different occupations. Nearly four in ten employed women in the Greensboro area (38 percent) work in professional and managerial jobs, which is higher proportion than employed men (29 percent; Table 2). The proportion of women and men working in professional and managerial jobs in the Greensboro area is slightly lower than in the state as a whole (Table 2).

While employed women in the Greensboro area are more likely than employed men to work in professional and managerial occupations, men are more likely to hold management positions than women (11 percent of employed men compared with 8 percent of employed women).<sup>4</sup> Men in the labor force are also more likely than women to work in computing, architecture, and engineering professions (5 percent compared with 2 percent). Employed women, however, are more likely than employed men to work in professional occupations such as education, training, and library occupations (9 percent of women compared with 3 percent of men) and in health care practitioner and technical occupations (also 9 percent of women compared with 3 percent of men).<sup>5</sup> There also is stark gender segregation among non-professional occupations: employed women in the Greensboro area are much more likely than employed men to work in office and administrative jobs (23 percent compared with 7 percent) and in healthcare support occupations (4 percent of women compared with 0.4 percent of men).<sup>6</sup> Men in the workforce are more likely than women to work in construction occupations (10 percent compared with 0.3 percent) or in transportation and material moving occupations (10 percent compared with 2 percent).<sup>7</sup>

Occupational segregation and women's under-representation in management jobs reduce women's earnings compared with men's. In 2008–2010, the median annual earnings for women employed full-time, year-round in the Greensboro area were \$32,300 compared with \$40,511 for men. This means that women earned only 80 cents for every dollar earned by men, which is less than the 83 cents they earn for every dollar earned by men in North Carolina but similar to the 79 cents they earn on the dollar compared with men in the nation overall (Table 2).<sup>8</sup>

<b>Table 2. Overview of Women's and Men's Economic Status</b>			
	<b>Greensboro Metropolitan Area</b>	<b>North Carolina</b>	<b>United States</b>
<b>Labor Force Participation Rate, Aged 16 and Older</b>			
Women	60%	59%	59%
Men	72%	70%	70%
Mothers with Children Under 18	75%	74%	73%
Fathers with Children Under 18	94%	94%	94%
<b>Percent of Employed Women and Men Who Work Full-Time, Aged 16 and Older</b>			
Women	73%	72%	71%
Men	85%	84%	84%
<b>Percent of Employed Women and Men in Professional or Managerial Occupations, Aged 16 and Older</b>			
Women	38%	40%	39%
Men	29%	30%	33%
<b>Median Annual Earnings, Full-Time, Year-Round Workers, Aged 16 and Older</b>			
Women	\$32,300	\$33,000	\$36,000
Men	\$40,511	\$40,000	\$45,500
<b>Gender Earnings Ratio, Aged 16 and Older</b>			
	80%	83%	79%
<b>Gender Earnings Ratio by Educational Attainment, Aged 25 and Older</b>			
Less Than High School Diploma	78%	76%	74%
High School Diploma or Equivalent	75%	75%	74%
Some College or Associate's Degree	80%	76%	76%
Bachelor's Degree or Higher	74%	70%	71%
<b>Proportion of Women and Men with a Bachelor's Degree or Higher, Aged 25 and Older</b>			
Women	25%	27%	28%
Men	26%	26%	29%
<b>Proportion of Men and Women with High School Diploma or Less, Aged 25 and Older</b>			
Women	44%	40%	42%
Men	48%	46%	44%
<b>Percent of Women and Men Living At or Below Poverty, Aged 18 and Older</b>			
Women	16%	17%	15%
Men	12%	13%	12%
<b>Percent of Households Receiving Food Stamps</b>			
	10%	13%	12%

Note: Data for the Greensboro area are for 2008–2010, except for households receiving food stamps and labor force participation of parents with children under 18, which are for 2010. Median annual earnings are in 2010 inflation-adjusted dollars. Data for North Carolina and the United States are for 2010 only.

Sources: IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 and 2010 American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

## Educational Attainment

One-fourth of all women aged 25 and older (25 percent) in the Greensboro area have a bachelor's degree or higher, a similar proportion to men (26 percent). Women in this area are less likely to have at least a bachelor's degree than women in the state or the nation (27 percent and 28 percent, respectively; Table 2).

A substantial number of women in the Greensboro area—an estimated 220,000—have only a high school diploma or the equivalent.<sup>9</sup> In this area, proportionately more men than women have such low educational attainment (48 compared with 44 percent; Table 2), but women with this level of formal education are less likely to have jobs with earnings sufficient to sustain a family. Median annual earnings for women in the Greensboro area who are employed full-time, year-round and have not completed high school were \$19,749 in 2008–2010, compared with \$25,320 for comparable men. With a high school diploma or the equivalent, women in this area earned \$26,535, which is considerably less than the \$35,448 earned by similarly-educated men. Women with some college education or an associate's degree earned \$32,409 between 2008 and 2010, compared with \$40,511 for comparable men.<sup>10</sup> Such earnings for women are below the annual income a family of one adult and two children needs to afford essential living expenses in the Greensboro area (Table 3).

In this area, as in the state and nation as a whole, having a college education raises the level of earnings for both women and men, but does not reduce the gender gap in earnings. Women in the Greensboro area who have a bachelor's degree or higher have median annual earnings of \$45,575, compared with \$62,000 for their male counterparts.<sup>11</sup> This disparity in earnings means that the gender wage gap is even larger when only women and men with a bachelor's degree or higher are compared: college-educated women in the Greensboro area make just 74 cents for every dollar earned by a college-educated man (Table 2).

## Poverty

A substantial number of women in the Greensboro area have incomes that leave them near or below the federal poverty line. Approximately 86,000 women aged 18 and older in this area live with incomes at or below the poverty line, and another 112,000 are *near* poverty (living with incomes between 100 and 200 percent of the federal poverty line).<sup>12</sup> Women in this area are slightly more likely to live at or below the poverty line than men (16 percent compared with 12 percent; Table 2), and 59 percent of all adults with poverty incomes are women.<sup>13</sup> Ten percent of households in Greensboro receive food stamps, a slightly lower proportion than in North Carolina as a whole (13 percent; Table 2).

Families headed by single women with children face a considerably higher risk of living in poverty than other families. Across the different counties in the Greensboro metropolitan area, the share of families headed by single women among all families with children under 18 ranges from 15 percent in Yadkin to 32 percent in Alamance (Table 3). Yet, in all counties in the Greensboro area, the share of all families in poverty that are headed by single women is at least twice as high; in Alamance, Forsyth, and Guilford, more than six in ten families in poverty with children under 18 are headed by single women. In North Carolina as a whole, slightly more than one in ten single women (12 percent) with young children under five who have incomes below the qualifying poverty threshold receive welfare cash assistance from Work First, North Carolina's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program.<sup>14</sup>

**Table 3. The Status of Children: Family Income, Poverty, and Child Care**

	Alamance	Davidson	Davie	Forsyth	Guilford	Randolph	Stokes	Yadkin	North Carolina
<b>Family Income</b>									
Annual Income a Family of One Adult and Two Children Needs to Afford Essential Living Expenses, 2010 <sup>1</sup>	\$40,887	\$34,454	\$40,655	\$41,021	\$41,497	\$41,114	\$40,655	\$40,272	\$41,920
Median Annual Income of Married-Couple Families with Children Under 18 Years, 2008–2010	\$63,869	\$66,865	\$67,229	\$75,784	\$76,136	\$58,946	\$63,881	\$55,789	\$70,124
Median Annual Income of Single Men With Children Under 18 Years, 2008–2010	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$29,022	\$30,020	N/A	N/A	\$29,091	\$29,874
Median Annual Income of Single Women With Children Under 18 Years, 2008–2010	\$21,996	\$20,061	N/A	\$19,560	\$22,242	\$21,231	N/A	N/A	\$20,393
Number of Families in Poverty With Children Under 18, 2008–2010 <sup>2</sup>	4,004	3,911	905	8,998	11,255	4,111	1,246	823	254,650
Share of Families in Poverty with Children That Are Headed by Single Women, 2008–2010 <sup>2</sup>	68%	54%	45%	69%	63%	52%	46%	33%	61%
Share of All Families with Children Under 18 That Are Headed by Single Women, 2008–2010 <sup>2</sup>	32%	22%	21%	31%	31%	26%	21%	15%	29%
<b>Child Care</b>									
Children Eligible for Child Care Subsidy, SFY 2010–2011 <sup>3</sup>	6,296	7,059	1,352	14,503	18,844	6,351	1,541	1,543	391,549
Budget Currently Available to Serve Eligible Children, SFY 2010–2011 <sup>3</sup>	\$6,054,333	\$5,587,447	\$1,298,272	\$13,508,598	\$21,225,092	\$5,493,939	\$1,377,238	\$855,605	N/A
Percent of Eligible Children Receiving Subsidized Child Care Services, SFY 2010–2011 <sup>3</sup>	19%	16%	17%	20%	24%	16%	16%	12%	N/A
Budget Per Child Eligible for Child Care Subsidy, SFY 2010–2011	\$961.62	\$791.54	\$960.26	\$931.43	\$1,126.36	\$865.05	\$893.73	\$554.51	N/A
Total Number of Children Aged 0 to 5 Enrolled in Child Care, 2011 <sup>4</sup>	3,229	2,930	577	7,293	12,211	2,271	796	485	207,953

Note: N/A indicates data are not available. Sources: <sup>1</sup>Sirota and McLenaghan 2010. <sup>2</sup>IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 American Community Survey data accessed through American Fact Finder. <sup>3</sup>North Carolina Division of Child Development and Early Education 2012. <sup>4</sup>The Annie E. Casey Foundation Data Center Kids Count 2012.

## Child Care

The lack of affordable child care is a major burden on many families in the Greensboro area, as in the nation as a whole. In the absence of quality, reasonably priced child care, women may interrupt their tenure in the labor market, reducing their ability to provide for their families and to save for retirement or emergencies. Alternatively, they may have to place their children in low-quality or unreliable care.

In North Carolina, the average fees for year-round, full-time child care range from \$6,227 (for a four-year old in a family child care home) to \$9,185 (for an infant in a child care center; Child Care Aware of America 2012). By comparison, the average annual tuition and fees for a public four-year college in North Carolina are \$5,685 (Child Care Aware of America 2012). In the Greensboro area, 57,489 children qualify for child care subsidies because their parents earn too little to afford the fees; yet fewer than one in four children receives any subsidized child care in any of Greensboro's eight counties (Table 3).

## Health

Health is an important component of women's and girls' overall well-being that contributes to their economic stability, educational attainment, and employment opportunities. While many women in the Greensboro area experience good health, health outcomes vary significantly by county in this region, suggesting that women's health care needs remain an important part of their status that must be examined and addressed.

Having health insurance coverage is critical to women's access to health care. Approximately 643,000<sup>15</sup> women (21 percent) aged 18–64 in the state, however, do not have basic health insurance (Table 4). In the Greensboro metropolitan area, Davidson County has the highest proportion of women without health insurance coverage (23 percent) and Stokes has the lowest (13 percent; Table 4). Lack of basic health insurance leaves women without coverage not only for basic wellness and check-up visits, but also for severe or chronic medical problems.

Mortality rates from heart disease also vary across the counties in the Greensboro area. When using an age-adjusted mortality rate, which accounts for distributional age differences among populations, Alamance, Davie, Forsyth, Guilford, and Stokes counties have mortality rates for the female population that are lower than the rate in the state overall (Table 4). Four counties within the Greensboro metropolitan area also have a higher female mortality rate for stroke and other cerebrovascular diseases than the state overall: Alamance, Davidson, Forsyth, and Stokes. Only Alamance has a mortality rate for diabetes among the female population that is higher than in the state as a whole (Table 4).<sup>16</sup>

Among counties in the Greensboro area with available data on cancer rates for women between 2005 and 2009, only Yadkin has a higher mortality rate from female breast cancer than the state overall. Alamance, Forsyth, and Stokes have higher mortality rates for ovarian cancer than in North Carolina, with Stokes having the highest rate at 11.2 per 100,000, compared with 7.9 per 100,000 for the state as a whole (Table 4).

Although teen pregnancy rates have fallen in the state and nationally in recent years, teenage pregnancy remains a significant concern in many areas. Four counties in the greater Greensboro area—Forsyth, Yadkin, Davidson, and Randolph—have rates of teen pregnancy (50.2, 51.7, 53.9, and 56.1 per 1,000, respectively) that are higher than the state average (49.7 per 1,000). Greensboro's four remaining counties—Stokes, Davie, Guilford, and Alamance—all have teen pregnancy rates well below the state average (Table 4).

**Table 4. Overview of Women's Health Status**

	Alamance	Davidson	Davie	Forsyth	Guilford	Randolph	Stokes	Yadkin	North Carolina	United States
<b>Total Number of Teen Pregnancies, Aged 15–19, 2010<sup>1</sup></b>	253	275	47	636	792	253	54	61	15,957	N/A
<b>Pregnancy Rate Among Teens Aged 15–19 (per 1,000), 2010<sup>1</sup></b>	44.5	53.9	35.9	50.2	41.7	56.1	35.5	51.7	49.7	N/A
<b>Average Annual Mortality Rates Among All Women (per 100,000)<sup>2</sup></b>										
Breast Cancer, 2005–2009	21.9	23.5	21.7	22.4	21.2	23.3	21.0	24.2	23.5	23.0
Cervical Cancer, 2005–2009	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.5	1.7	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.3	2.4
Uterine Cancer, 2005–2009	4.6	3.6	N/A	3.9	3.7	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.0	4.2
Ovarian Cancer, 2005–2009	9.6	6.7	N/A	8.3	7.2	7.8	11.2	N/A	7.9	8.2
<b>Heart Disease Mortality Rate, All Ages, 2005–2009<sup>3</sup></b>	136.4	180.5	122.6	123.0	135.7	159.1	150.5	156.7	153.6	161.0
<b>Mortality Rate for Stroke and Other Cerebrovascular Diseases, All Ages, 2005–2009<sup>3</sup></b>	55.1	54.9	33.9	51.7	46.2	50.1	68.5	46.5	50.4	42.7
<b>Diabetes Mortality Rate, All Ages, 2005–2009<sup>3</sup></b>	23.4	20.8	N/A	18.5	15.6	16.3	17.5	19.1	20.8	19.8
<b>Percent of Women without Health Insurance, Aged 18–64, 2008–2010<sup>4</sup></b>	22%	23%	15%	19%	19%	21%	13%	15%	21%	19%

Notes: N/A indicates data are not available.

All mortality rates are per 100,000 and age-adjusted to the total U.S. population in 2000.

Sources: <sup>1</sup> North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services 2012.

<sup>2</sup> IWPR compilation of data from the National Cancer Institute State Cancer Profiles 2012.

<sup>3</sup> IWPR compilation of data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2012.

<sup>4</sup> IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 and 2010 American Community Survey data accessed through American Fact Finder (U.S. Department of Commerce 2012); data for North Carolina and the United States are from 2010 only.

## Conclusion

Many women in the Greensboro area are thriving, yet the data reviewed in this fact sheet show that there are still many areas for improvement, including the wage gap, the dearth of affordable child care, and the lack of basic health insurance. Policy recommendations to address these challenges include

- promoting quality flexible working practices to make it easier for parents to combine paid work with care giving;

- ensuring that employers are aware of their obligations under the federal anti-discrimination statutes and provide training to employers on best practices for recruiting and retaining women workers, particularly in sectors where they are now under-represented;
- increasing career counseling and financial supports, including for childcare, for women with low levels of education;
- facilitating further access to education, including for those who do not speak English as their first language;
- monitoring workforce development to ensure that women and men have equal access to training in high growth well paid careers;
- supporting more targeted teen pregnancy prevention programs and increased support for teens who are already pregnant and parenting; and
- ensuring that all families who need it receive ‘Work First,’ North Carolina’s Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program.

## Methodological Notes

This briefing paper presents data for the Greensboro Metropolitan Statistical Area, defined to include Alamance, Davidson, Davie, Guilford, Forsyth, Randolph, Stokes, and Yadkin counties. Demographic and economic data are based on IWPR analysis of the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series version of the American Community Survey (Ruggles et al. 2010) and on American Community Survey data accessed through American Fact Finder. Except where otherwise noted, IWPR used estimates that combine several years of data (2008–2010) for the Greensboro Metropolitan Area metropolitan area; these estimates ensure sufficient sample sizes that allow for reliable reporting. Data for the state and nation as a whole are based on one-year (2010) data. Data on child care come from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Child Care Aware of America, and the North Carolina Division of Child Development and Early Education. Data on women’s health status are from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Cancer Institute, and the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services; for some indicators, data are not be available for all counties because the number of sample cases is too small. To define the Greensboro area, IWPR used the Greensboro Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) variable in the IPUMS American Community Survey (Ruggles et al. 2010).

## References

Annie E. Casey Foundation. 2012. Data Center Kids Count. <<http://datacenter.kidscount.org/>> (accessed September 15, 2012).

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics. 2012. Underlying Cause of Death 1999–2009 on CDC Wonder Online Database <<http://wonder.cdc.gov/>> (accessed December 28, 2012).

Child Care Aware of America. 2012. “2012 State Fact Sheets.” <[http://www.naccrra.org/sites/default/files/default\\_site\\_pages/2012/cca\\_sf\\_finaljuly12.pdf](http://www.naccrra.org/sites/default/files/default_site_pages/2012/cca_sf_finaljuly12.pdf)> (accessed September 17, 2012).

Hegewisch, Ariane and Claudia Williams. 2011. “The Gender Wage Gap: 2010.” Fact Sheet #C350. Washington, DC: Institute for Women’s Policy Research.

National Cancer Institute. 2012. State Cancer Profiles. <<http://statecancerprofiles.cancer.gov/deathrates/deathrates.html>> (accessed September 27, 2012).

North Carolina Division of Child Development and Early Education. 2012. Child Care Subsidy Services Makes a Difference for Children and Communities.

<[http://ncchildcare.dhhs.state.nc.us/pdf\\_forms/subsidy\\_county\\_fact\\_sheets\\_11\\_12.pdf](http://ncchildcare.dhhs.state.nc.us/pdf_forms/subsidy_county_fact_sheets_11_12.pdf)> (accessed September 17, 2012).

North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services, State Center for Health Statistics. 2012. "Pregnancy, Fertility, Abortion Rates and Abortion Fractions by Race for Females Ages 15–19 North Carolina, Regions and Counties." North Carolina Division of Public Health. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services. <<http://www.schs.state.nc.us/SCHS/data/pregnancies/2010/preg1519.pdf>> (accessed September 30, 2012).

Ruggles, Steven, J. Trent Alexander, Katie Genadek, Ronald Goeken, Matthew B. Schroeder, and Matthew Sobek. 2010. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0* [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Shaefer, Luke H. 2009. "Part-Time Workers: Some Key Differences Between Primary and Secondary Earners." *Monthly Labor Review* (October):3–15.

Sirota, Alexandra and Edwin McLenaghan. 2010. *Making Ends Meet After the Great Recession: The 2010 Living Income Standard for North Carolina*. Raleigh-Durham, NC: North Carolina Justice Center.

[http://www.ncjustice.org/sites/default/files/LIVING\\_INCOME\\_Standard\\_-\\_2011--REVISED\\_0.pdf](http://www.ncjustice.org/sites/default/files/LIVING_INCOME_Standard_-_2011--REVISED_0.pdf)

Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM). 2011. *2011 Employee Benefits: Examining Employee Benefits Amidst Uncertainty*. Alexandria, VA: SHRM.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, American Fact Finder. 2012. *2010 and 2008–2010 American Community Survey*. Table B27001: Health Insurance and Table B17001: Poverty.

<<http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>> (accessed September 14, 2012).

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2011. *Geographic Profile of Employment and Unemployment, 2010 Bulletin 2768*. <<http://www.bls.gov/opub/gp/pdf/gp10full.pdf>> (accessed October 3, 2012).

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> The Greensboro Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) is comprised of Alamance, Davidson, Davie, Guilford, Forsyth, Randolph, Stokes, and Yadkin counties.

<sup>2</sup> IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 IPUMS American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

<sup>3</sup> IWPR calculation based on U.S. Department of Labor (2011) "Table 23: States: Persons at Work 1 to 34 Hours by Sex, Age, Race, Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity, and Hours of Work, 2010 Annual Averages."

<sup>4</sup> IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 IPUMS American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

<sup>5</sup> IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 IPUMS American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

<sup>6</sup> IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 IPUMS American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

<sup>7</sup> IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 IPUMS American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

<sup>8</sup> Because these estimates are based on the American Community Survey, they are not strictly comparable to IWPR's standard calculation of the gender wage gap for the United States, which is based on the Current Population Survey (CPS). In 2010, the national earnings gap based on the CPS was 23 percent (Hegewisch and Williams 2011).

<sup>9</sup> IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 IPUMS American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

<sup>10</sup> IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 IPUMS American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

---

<sup>11</sup> IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 IPUMS American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

<sup>12</sup> IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 IPUMS American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

<sup>13</sup> IWPR analysis of 2008–2010 IPUMS American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

<sup>14</sup> IWPR analysis of 2010 IPUMS American Community Survey microdata (Ruggles et al. 2010).

<sup>15</sup> IWPR analysis of 2010 American Community Survey data accessed through American Fact Finder (U.S. Department of Commerce 2012).

<sup>15</sup> Heart disease includes acute and chronic rheumatic fever and heart disease, hypertensive heart and renal disease, ischaemic heart disease, pulmonary heart disease and diseases of pulmonary circulation, and other forms of heart disease. Cerebrovascular disease includes cerebral haemorrhages, cerebral infarction, stroke, and other cerebrovascular diseases. Diabetes includes diabetes mellitus.

This briefing paper was prepared by Ariane Hegewisch, Rhiana Gunn-Wright, and Claudia Williams with support provided by the N.C. Council for Women, Wells Fargo, the North Carolina Women’s Fund at the North Carolina Community Foundation, and Women to Women of the Community Foundation of Greater Greensboro.

**For more information on IWPR reports or membership, please call (202) 785-5100, e-mail [iwpr@iwpr.org](mailto:iwpr@iwpr.org), or visit [www.iwpr.org](http://www.iwpr.org).**

*The Institute for Women’s Policy Research (IWPR) conducts rigorous research and disseminates its findings to address the needs of women, promote public dialogue, and strengthen families, communities, and societies. The Institute works with policymakers, scholars, and public interest groups to design, execute, and disseminate research that illuminates economic and social policy issues affecting women and their families, and to build a network of individuals and organizations that conduct and use women-oriented policy research. IWPR’s work is supported by foundation grants, government grants and contracts, donations from individuals, and contributions from organizations and corporations. IWPR is a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization that also works in affiliation with the women’s studies, public policy, and public administration programs at The George Washington University.*